

Scott M. Matheson, Governor Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

July 3, 1984

Mr. Bart Hanford Project Engineer 555 First Security Building 405 South Main Street Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

RE: Mining and Reclamation Plan Review

North Lilly Project

PRO/023/007

Juab County, Utah

Dear Mr. Hanford;

Please find enclosed the Division's review of Affiliated Mining Inc. - Lee Mining Company's most recent submittal for its mining and reclamation plan. Several areas still remain deficient from the previous submittal and indicate that perhaps a meeting with the staff would be appropriate. Please call Tom Tetting of my staff if you have any questions or wish to arrange a meeting.

Sincerely,

James W. Smith, Jr.,

Administrator,

Mineral Resource Development and

Reclamation Program

JWS/TNT:grc 94810

cc: Thomas N. Tetting, DOGM Mary M. Boucek, DOGM

Enclosure

#### MINING AND RECLAMATION PLAN REVIEW

Lee Mining Company North Lily Project PRO/023/007, Juab County, Utah

July 2, 1984

The following rules and regulations of the Mined Land Reclamation Act, Title 40-8, UCA 1953, will still need to be addressed prior to the Division giving tentative approval for the operation and publishing the required 30-day notice:

## Rule M-3(2)(c) and (d) Notice of Intention - PGL

It is stated in the MRP that the "vertical profiles of existing piles will be reduced and the creation of a broad, flatter tailing pile will fill in and cover hazardous portions of the old, abandoned millsite." The regulation requires that the plan be described more completely (i.e., extent, number of cubic yards moved, slopes graded to what grade and how accomplished, etc.). Please provide more clarification.

# Rule M-5 Surety Guarantee - PGL

The applicant must provide a detailed cost estimate for the reclamation of the site with a breakdown of each reclamation activity and its associated cost. For example, how many cubic yards of topsoil will be hauled or cubic yards of backfill at \$ x/cy. The Division uses the Means Site Work Cost Index (an accepted contractor index) for determining the costs for reclamation. Please complete the bonding form or use it as a guide in detailing the cost estimate.

# Rule M-10(12) Revegetation - SC

The applicant has indicated that revegetation test plots are to be employed (MR-1, 25D). If this is correct, plans for initiation of the plots as well as a discussion of how success of the plots will be monitored, and how the results will be used to determine revegetation procedures should be discussed.

The report from Native Plants, Inc., on existing vegetative cover for the area of proposed disturbance should be submitted as soon as it is completed. Please indicate the date the report will available.

- 2 -

### Rule M-10(14) Soils - EH

Analysis of the subsoil in the borrow area will provide an estimate of the quality of the material present and the chances for successful revegetation.

Native Plants, Inc., should be qualified to evaluate the area for soil quality. Their report must be forwarded to the Division.

The quality of the reprocessed tailing material as a plant growth medium will be marginal. Without the application of soil the chances for reclamation will be poor. Therefore, a variance from the use of topsoil cannot be granted.

### Variances

### Rule M-10(3) Impoundments

The applicant has already addressed the appropriate regulation and no variance, as determined by the Division, is necessary at this time, and therefore will not be granted.

### Rule M-10(6) Toxic Materials

A variance cannot be granted for the following reasons:

- 1. State Department of Health regulations must be complied with and their approval must be supplied to this office prior to the Division publishing its tentative approval notice.
- 2. Toxic or potentially toxic material will be neutralized or isolated on-site as already committed to by the applicant.

# Rule M-10(11) Sediment Control

The fact that all solutions will be contained on site does not obviate the additional fact that the applicant is responsible for maintaining adequate sediment and erosion control measures. These measures are simply those which will prevent loss of topsoil or create unnecessary disturbances to the environment, both of which the applicant has already addressed. Therefore, a variance cannot be granted.

# Rule M-10(14) Soils

This request for a variance has been rejected for the reason stated under Rule M-10(14) - EH above.

If you have any questions or you wish to meet with the Division staff to discuss this review, please do not hesitate to call. Upon satisfaction of the above concerns, the Division will publish notice of tentative approval to solicit public comment for a 30-day period. The form and amount of surety will be presented to the Board for approval at the first hearing date following completion of the required comment period. Subsequent to posting the reclamation surety the Division will issue final approval.

cc: Jim Smith, DOGM
Mary Boucek, DOGM
Steve Cox, DOGM
Pam Grubaugh-Littig, DOGM
Ev Hooper, DOGM
Tom Tetting, DOGM

94810